

MINUTES

UTAH EMERGENCY MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPY LICENSING BOARD MEETING

October 5, 2006

**Room 464 – 4th Floor – 9:00 A.M.
Heber Wells Building**

CONVENED: 9:10 A.M.

ADJOURNED: 11:10 A.M.

Bureau Manager:

Noel Taxin

Board Secretary:

Karen McCall

Board Members Present:

Jean N. Soderquist, PhD

Karen Feinauer

James M. Harper, PhD, Chairperson

Lanae Valentine, PhD

Richard Nielsen, PhD

Guests:

Craig Jackson, Division Director

Dee Thorell, Investigator

Brittany Butsch, Investigator

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS:

Reading and approving the minutes from the September 15, 2006 Board Meeting

This item is deferred to the next scheduled Board meeting.

APPOINTMENTS:

9:30 A.M.

Suzanne Dastrup, Probationary Meeting

Dr. Dastrup met for her appointment.

Dr. Harper conducted the interview.

Dr. Harper informed Dr. Dastrup that Judge Eklund provided copies of her voice messages for the Board and the Board listened to them. He asked Dr. Dastrup if it is her understanding that she needs to contact Ms. Taxin with questions

regarding her probation.

Dr. Dastrup responded that when she is acting in the role as her attorney she should go through the legal people and Judge Eklund, which is then the appropriate person to contact. She stated that when she is acting in the role of an MFT probationer then she does understand that she should contact Ms. Taxin.

Dr. Harper stated that when Dr. Dastrup goes through Ms. Taxin that all information is privy to the Board. He stated that the Board cannot act individually is in when she calls him for individual consultation. He stated that the Board is supposed to act as one in making decisions.

Dr. Harper stated that one message to Judge Eklund states that he, Dr. Harper, approved someone to be her supervisor and that is an inaccurate statement. Dr. Harper stated that he does not approve or deny supervisors and the Board, as a Board, is the forum for approval.

Dr. Harper stated that the Board met today as Dr. Dastrup received a letter saying she needs an approved supervisor by October 6, 2006 or she would be required to cease and desist in her practice until an approved supervisor is established.

Dr. Harper explained that Dr. Dastrup's original Order had to be revised in order to change the approved supervisor.

Dr. Dastrup responded that she understood. She stated that, as her own attorney she requested that only the section requiring Don Price to be the supervisor be changed.

Ms. Taxin responded that in the change of the Order the reports are due monthly. She stated that she changed the requirement to monthly for the first 6 months and then quarterly once approved by the Board.

Dr. Dastrup stated that her original Order does not say

the reports are due monthly.

Dr. Harper stated that Dr. Dastrup has said she was going to go to Dr. Veon Smith for supervision. Dr. Harper asked if Dr. Dastrup has contacted Dr. Smith.

Dr. Dastrup responded that she has met with Dr. Smith once. She stated that she was given a signed statement from Dr. Smith and also has a vitae from him to submit. She stated that she met with Dr. Smith so that she could document supervision this week and would not be out of compliance. She asked if the Board would like to have the information.

Dr. Harper responded that she should submit the information.

Dr. Dastrup submitted the information. She asked where the Order required monthly reports be submitted.

Ms. Taxin reviewed the original Order and read “Respondent’s practice shall be subject to weekly direct supervision by Dr. Price”... and “Dr. Price’s report shall be provided to the Board no later than February 17, 2006.” Ms. Taxin stated that the Order indicates the reports should be submitted weekly as the original Order required she and Dr. Price meet weekly.

Dr. Dastrup argued that the minutes do not reflect monthly reports. She stated that she cannot be responsible nor provide something that she does not know about. Dr. Dastrup stated that Dr. Price finally received a report form after the September 15, 2006 meeting.

Dr. Harper suggested the Board, Ms. Taxin and Dr. Dastrup go back to the original Order and review the changes required for the Amended Order.

Ms. Taxin responded that Dr. Price’s name was throughout the document and the Amended Order changed each area where the name appeared.

Dr. Harper requested clarification regarding the requirement for monthly reports.

Ms. Taxin again referred to number 3, “Respondent’s practice shall be subject to weekly direct supervision by Dr. Price, commencing 30 days from the date this Recommended Order may be adopted by the Division.” Ms. Taxin stated that the Division has not yet received any information that Dr. Dastrup and Dr. Price reviewed and discussed the issues that brought Dr. Dastrup before the Board.

Ms. Taxin then reviewed number 4 of the original order, “Dr. Price shall submit a written report to the Board, which sets forth his review of Respondent’s practice and the nature of his supervision of that practice. Dr. Price’s report shall be provided to the Board no later than February 17, 2006.” Ms. Taxin stated that the Order does not specifically say when the reports are due but it is usually monthly and if everything is going well the Board considers a change to quarterly. Ms. Taxin reminded the Board and Dr. Dastrup that she was not involved with the original Order and, therefore, could not comment on the inconsistent nature of Dr. Dastrup’s Order compared to other probationary Orders.

Dr. Dastrup asked if all other probationers submit monthly reports.

Ms. Taxin confirmed that the other probationers do submit monthly reports. Ms. Taxin stated that the only content change from the original Order was removing a specific supervisor and opening the supervision up for an approved supervisor.

Dr. Harper read the amended Order to Dr. Dastrup.

Mr. Jackson commented that the Division cannot amend an Order to be different than the original. Mr. Jackson stated that it would be appropriate for Dr. Dastrup to agree to the change of requiring monthly reports for 6 months and then, upon approval of the Board, moving to quarterly

reports.

Dr. Harper noted that the number 5 of the original Order states “Respondent shall meet with the Board on a quarterly basis, commencing with the Board’s March 3, 2006 meeting. During Respondent’s initial meeting with the Board, the Board will review the reports submitted by Dr. Buxton and Dr. Price and determine whether further terms and conditions are necessary to govern Respondent’s practice or whether the Recommended Order set forth herein should be otherwise modified.”

Ms. Taxin responded that if there is confusion in the amended Order then Dr. Dastrup would need to agree to the language change.

Dr. Dastrup responded that she received the supervision report form on September 22, 2006. She stated that she called Karen, the Board secretary, and was told that she needed an approved supervisor by October 6, 2006 or she would have to cease her practice. Dr. Dastrup stated that she was scared she would lose her license. She stated that she requested Karen to inform Ms. Taxin that all further communications need to be in writing. She stated that her practice is her livelihood and she needs to keep confusion out. Dr. Dastrup stated that she has experienced frustration in this process.

Ms. Taxin reminded Dr. Dastrup that a supervision report form for Dr. Price to complete was given to her at her first meeting.

Dr. Dastrup asked Mr. Jackson if it would be appropriate for her to e-mail Ms. Taxin when she has questions. Dr. Dastrup then commented that at her telephonic appointment on June 2, 2006, she was not aware that a Board motion had been made to approve a new supervisor. She stated that she also was not aware that Dave Geary, AAG, was present at the meeting. She stated that her appointment was completed when Mr. Geary commented that her Order would need to be amended to change her supervisor. Dr. Dastrup stated she was not being defiant but she was really not aware that written reports were required

of her supervisor.

Dr. Harper responded to Dr. Dastrup that she may e-mail Ms. Taxin. He stated that Ms. Taxin may not always be able to respond as it might be that Dr. Dastrup is asking something that should be presented to the Board for a formal decision. Dr. Harper stated that Ms. Taxin's September 26, 2006, letter to Dr. Dastrup regarding approval of Richard Miller as her supervisor and outlining the supervision requirements is pretty clear. Dr. Harper read the following requirements:

- 1. Meet with Richard Miller.**
- 2. Richard Miller must read the Order.**
- 3. Richard Miller must agree to supervise Dr. Dastrup.**
- 4. Richard Miller must write a letter to the Division and Board stating that he has read the Order and agrees to support the requirements for Dr. Dastrup to remain in compliance with the Order.**
- 5. Richard Miller must provide a resume or vita.**
- 6. Dr. Dastrup will need to provide Richard Miller with the supervision form.**
- 7. Dr. Dastrup will need to provide Richard Miller any information he requests regarding the reasons she is on probation and information to contact Ms. Taxin, Bureau Manager, or Karen McCall, Bureau Secretary.**
- 8. Dr. Dastrup will need to coordinate with Richard Miller's work schedule to assure that he is able to help her to meet the requirements for supervision.**
- 9. Dr. Dastrup will need to have all this in place by October 6, 2006 to remain in compliance.**

Ms. Taxin stated that if this supervisor did not work out, another approved supervisor would have to follow the above guidelines.

Dr. Harper stated that Ms. Taxin gave Dr. Dastrup 2 weeks to get the above in order so she would not have to cease sessions with her clients due to the immediate resignation of Don Price, her past

supervisor.

Dr. Dastrup responded that the letter and 9 point list was clear to her. She stated that she has given a copy of the letter to Dr. Veon Smith as Dr. Richard Miller decided not to be her supervisor.

Dr. Harper then stated that he was of the opinion that the original Order was clear about requirements of Dr. Dastrup's probation.

Dr. Dastrup stated that she knows the Board has discussions about her. She stated that she knows that Ms. Taxin perceives her as being defiant and the Board listens to Ms. Taxin and then agrees.

Dr. Harper responded that the Board does not always agree with Ms. Taxin. He stated that when Dr. Dastrup meets with the Board she often seems confused and defiant and makes comments that often contradict other statements she makes. He stated that it is difficult for the Board and Division to know if she is processing the discussion clearly.

Dr. Dastrup responded that the process of the hearing and probation has been adversarial and the probation unclear. She stated that her inconsistencies are that she does not have full information on what she is supposed to say and respond to. Dr. Dastrup stated that she has tried to master the skill of ready body language and when Ms. Taxin rolled her head and eyes it was an indication of Ms. Taxin being angry with her. Dr. Dastrup stated she could not understand why Ms. Taxin would be angry. She continued that she understands the adversarial system is different than the clinical system but she is getting double messages and knows there is collusion and will not be pulled into the situation. She stated that she feels ambushed and tries not to get off balance but does try to articulate what and how she is feeling.

Dr. Nielsen commented that his impression is that Dr. Dastrup is passive/aggressive even though she has stated that she is not. He stated that Dr. Dastrup was reluctant at one of her first appointments and again at the telephonic meeting. Dr. Nielsen stated that the Board and Division have

received the message that Dr. Dastrup does not understand what they are telling her.

Dr. Dastrup stated that she appreciated the feedback.

Dr. Harper stated that the requirements in the Order and the Amendment are not that difficult. He stated that his impression of what happened with Dr. Dastrup and Dr. Price was that Dr. Price agreed with Dr. Dastrup in the unfairness of being on probation. Dr. Harper stated that he is hoping the same does not happen with a new supervisor. He stated that Dr. Dastrup may feel it was unfair but the Board was at the hearing and heard everything she was allowed to present. He stated that the Order was established based on her presentation in the Hearing and if the supervision under Dr. Price had worked out there would not have been a reason to amend the Order. He concluded that the supervision did not work out and the Order had to be amended.

Dr. Dastrup stated that it was odd that her request to amend the facts in her Order did not arrive until a day late and her request was then denied. She stated that she was in the process of requesting the amendment when she met with Dr. Price the first time. She then asked if there is any way to change the findings of fact in the Order.

Dr. Dastrup stated that she gave Dr. Richard Smith a copy of her Order and stated that she would do whatever he wanted to complete her probation requirements.

Dr. Harper responded to the question of changing the facts in the Order by stating he did not know if facts could be changed. He suggested Dr. Dastrup contact Judge Eklund for the information as the Board meeting is not designed to rehear the hearing information.

Dr. Dastrup asked if the Board is asking her to agree to the Amended Order.

Dr. Harper responded that the amendment has been made and approved by Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Jackson stated that the area of a specific supervisor had to be changed and the Board and Division are asking for monthly reports from her approved supervisor.

Dr. Dastrup then stated that it appeared the Division is cleaning up the original Order.

Ms. Taxin again stated that she was not involved in the original Order. She stated that the only way to deal with Dr. Dastrup's concern about changing the facts in the original Order would be to request another hearing and present the information again. Ms. Taxin stated that the Order had to be amended for Dr. Dastrup to have a supervisor. She explained that if the Order was not amended Dr. Dastrup would be out of compliance and the Board would have to take additional action against the license.

Dr. Dastrup commented that she only wanted the name of the supervisor changed.

Mr. Jackson reminded Dr. Dastrup that she agreed to the monthly reports a few minutes ago.

Ms. Taxin stated that it is not appropriate for her to continue to call Judge Eklund. She suggested Dr. Dastrup contact her with her questions and comments. Ms. Taxin stated that the Division has the authority to amend the Order but does not have authority to change the facts of the hearing.

Dr. Dastrup responded that Mr. Geary, AAG, calls Judge Eklund. She stated that she is powerless and the messages she has saved from Ms. Taxin and Karen and the letter she received all give different information. She stated that it is interesting that the Division is able to amend the Order but cannot change the facts of the hearing.

Dr. Harper asked if Dr. Dastrup is requesting the Board to consider and approve Dr. Veon Smith as her supervisor.

Dr. Dastrup responded that she mentioned in one of

her e-mails everyone she wanted considered. She stated that she does not know Dr. Veon Smith but will have him supervise if the Board approves.

Dr. Harper stated that sometimes he perceives Dr. Dastrup as being helpless in finding a supervisor. He stated that when she called him she said she had exhausted the list and could not find a supervisor. Dr. Harper stated that he reviewed her list and commented that she had not contacted 2 additional people. He remarked that he thinks Dr. Dastrup wants the Board to find her a supervisor. He stated that he is hearing the helplessness again in her voice when she says she does not know Dr. Veon Smith but will go to him. Dr. Harper again asked if Dr. Veon Smith is who she wants or is there someone else she is interested in having the Board consider.

Dr. Dastrup stated that Dr. Veon Smith would be fine as Ms. Taxin had related through Ms. McCall that the supervisor must be someone that she does not know and has not had a previous relationship with. She stated that she was not aware of a motion being made at the June 2, 2006 meeting until she read the minutes.

Dr. Harper again asked what Dr. Dastrup wants now.

Dr. Dastrup responded that she submitted 3 names and resumes for the Board to consider. She stated that Ms. Taxin's letter said to contact her immediately if someone on the list cannot supervise her.

Ms. Taxin stated that she was trying to locate someone to supervise Dr. Dastrup who would be closer in proximity as Dr. Dastrup had voiced frustration with Dr. Price being a long distance from her and his fees were so high. Ms. Taxin stated that she was hoping Dr. Richard Miller would agree to supervise Dr. Dastrup as he is located in Provo, Utah. She stated that Dr. Tim Lowe is in Santiquin, Utah and Dr. Veon Smith is in South Jordan which makes both a distance from Dr. Dastrup. Ms. Taxin stated that she does not know any of these people but was trying to listen and meet Dr. Dastrup's concerns.

Dr. Dastrup again commented that Ms. Taxin has had the opportunity to shape the minds of the Board and she has not had her chance to talk.

Dr. Harper again stated that the Board does not always agree with Ms. Taxin. He again stated that Dr. Dastrup has been unclear in her meetings with the Board and her requirements for probation are not difficult by meeting weekly, having the supervisor visit her office sites at random, review files at random and write a report for the Board. He stated that there are times the Board does make decision that may not get communicated to her. Dr. Harper commented that he is concerned that Dr. Dastrup obtains a Board approved supervisor. He stated that the Amended Order requires monthly reports for 6 months and then quarterly reports if approved by the Division or Board. He stated that it is important to listen to the monthly and then quarterly requirement as the monthly cannot change to quarterly until the Division or Board approves the change.

Dr. Dastrup responded that she did not appreciate Dr. Harper talking down to her. She again stated that the Board made a motion without her knowledge.

Dr. Harper stated that he is not talking down to her but is very frustrated that it appears she is not understanding what the requirements of supervision include.

Dr. Dastrup then responded back what the requirements are. She stated that she thinks she understands but the Board does not understand her.

Dr. Nielsen asked Dr. Dastrup if she is willing to comply with the Amended Order.

Dr. Dastrup responded that she does not have a choice. She stated that the Amended Order has not yet been reviewed by her or her attorney.

Dr. Nielsen suggested the Amended Order be read out loud for Dr. Dastrup.

Dr. Harper asked if Dr. Dastrup wanted to read the Amended Order out loud.

Dr. Dastrup declined stating it was not necessary.

Ms. Feinauer commented that the Division and Board understand that this is an emotional time for Dr. Dastrup. She stated that when she is emotional she does not process like she should. Ms. Feinauer stated that during the telephone conversation Ms. Taxin informed Dr. Dastrup that she had the option of choosing a different supervisor who would be more adaptable to her needs. Ms. Feinauer stated that Dr. Dastrup had that option open to her and the communication was open to her. She stated that this meeting is not adversarial in any way as the Division and the Board want her to succeed and would like her to be more comfortable in the process.

Dr. Dastrup thanked Ms. Feinauer for her comments and stated that she has never wanted anyone but Dr. Price as her supervisor but did want less frequent supervision. She stated it was devastating to her to have to get a new supervisor.

Dr. Harper again asked if Dr. Veon Smith is who Dr. Dastrup would like the Board to consider for her supervisor.

Dr. Dastrup responded that Dr. Veon Smith is who she wants considered.

Dr. Harper asked if there was anyone else she also wanted the Board to consider.

Dr. Dastrup responded there was no one else.

Dr. Harper asked if there were any further comments from the Board.

Dr. Soderquist responded that she has waited the whole meeting for Dr. Dastrup to say what the Board wanted to hear. She stated that Dr. Dastrup has consistently stated she is confused and does not understand. Dr. Soderquist stated that the Board has attempted to clarify the Order for Dr. Dastrup

and it was amended not to confuse but to clarify. Dr. Soderquist asked Dr. Dastrup to listen to her voice and words and hear what the Board has said to clarify and process when she listens to the tapes of the meetings. She stated it would have been easy to say 2 strikes and you are out but the Board has tried to be supportive of the process of her growth. She stated that the growth has happened in other cases but has not appeared to be happening in Dr. Dastrup's case. Dr. Soderquist concluded that she is thinking that the growth is now happening.

Dr. Harper stated that the amendment is clear and Dr. Dastrup will find that the meetings will be less adversarial as long as she is in compliance. He stated that he thinks there are still some misconceptions as clients do not always understand termination. He stated that there is some contradictory communication when Dr. Dastrup says she does not have a copy of the amended Order when the Board saw that she was given a copy at the beginning of the meeting.

Dr. Harper stated that the Board would have to discuss Dr. Smith being her supervisor and then would respond to Dr. Dastrup. He stated that Dr. Smith has practiced MFT a long time and he has seen Dr. Smith in many different situations where he has handled the situation professionally.

Ms. Taxin commented that the supervisor should be someone who is able to help Dr. Dastrup so she does not get into this position again.

Dr. Dastrup stated that she is comfortable with Dr. Smith and the distance would not be a problem for her. She stated that Dr. Smith has read the original Order and is willing to supervise her.

Dr. Nielsen stated that he knows Dr. Smith. He stated Dr. Smith has had many years of experience and would be a good supervisor.

Dr. Soderquist stated that she also knows Dr. Smith socially. She stated that he is very polite and soft spoken. She stated that it helped her to know Dr. Smith can be firm professionally if needed

based on other Board members comments.

Dr. Valentine remarked that she does not know Dr. Smith.

Ms. Feinauer commented that it is important for Dr. Dastrup and the Board to feel comfortable with Dr. Smith as the supervisor.

Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Dastrup needs to feel that Dr. Smith can help her so she can grow. She stated that it is Dr. Dastrup's responsibility to make sure Dr. Smith follows through to get the monthly reports submitted. She stated that when Dr. Dastrup is scheduled to meet the report must be submitted at least 2 weeks prior so she can review the report and be ready to present it to the Board at the meeting.

Dr. Harper concurred that it is important for Dr. Dastrup to take responsibility to be sure the reports are submitted.

Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Dastrup is welcome to call Ms. McCall to ask if reports have been received and she should ask for a copy from Dr. Smith for her files. Ms. Taxin stated that the supervisor is the eyes for the Division and Board and it is their job to report how she is doing, what she is doing, how she is growing, to be sure Dr. Dastrup understands what she did to bring her before the Board and make sure it does not happen again.

Dr. Nielsen commented that if it does not work out with Dr. Smith then the Board will have to address approving a different supervisor.

Dr. Harper commented that he would prefer a female supervisor but he is agreeable with Dr. Smith.

Dr. Dastrup responded that it appears there is an ongoing perception that she does not follow the rules. She stated that once she knows what is expected or what to ask for then she does pay attention to the details. She stated she did not know there was a form

for the supervisor to complete and now that she does know she will make sure it is completed and sent.

Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Dastrup's Order is one of easiest and most simple that she has seen. She stated that the Division and Board want to make sure they and Dr. Dastrup are all on the same page and understand everything clearly. She stated that she would like to see her be in compliance and would like to be able to terminate the probation early based on Dr. Dastrup's compliance.

Ms. Taxin stated that, if Dr. Smith is approved, he would need to send a letter that he has read the Order and the Amended Order and is willing to supervise and assist Dr. Dastrup in completing the requirements. Ms. Taxin stated that the supervision form should say Dr. Dastrup and Dr. Smith met on these dates, this is what was discussed, this is what Dr. Dastrup is working on, this is what was found at the random visits to the office locations and this is what was found in the randomly reviewed files. Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Smith may use additional sheets of paper if necessary to write a complete report and give details regarding his recommendation. She stated that the supervision report may be faxed but faxed copies are sometimes difficult to read and the original copy must be submitted.

Dr. Nielsen made a motion to approve Dr. Veon Smith as Dr. Suzanne Dastrup's supervisor.

Dr. Valentine seconded the motion.

The Board vote was unanimous.

Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Dastrup now has an approved supervisor and recommended they meet next week.

Dr. Harper notified Dr. Dastrup that her next appointment will be December 8, 2006.

Ms. Taxin stated that the December 8, 2006 meeting will not be the quarter but Dr. Dastrup should meet to be sure she is on track with her

probation.

Dr. Harper requested Dr. Dastrup to contact Ms. Taxin in the future to make sure there are no misunderstandings.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Approved Supervisors

Dr. Harper requested the Board review the supervisor form at the next scheduled meeting. He stated that he has talked with Thorana Nelson regarding a website to list who has completed the supervision course through her and she said she might be willing to include people who submit information regarding how long they have been supervising.

Dr. Soderquist stated that a disclaimer could be included in the website.

Ms. Taxin commented that she will put Thorana Nelson on the December agenda.

Clarification

Dr. Harper commented that there is rumor going around that the 3rd track requirements in the Rules was changed in order for his wife to obtain additional business. He stated that Debra Hendren, Bureau Manager, was working on the Rules before Ms. Taxin became the Bureau Manager and his wife being an LCSW had nothing to do with the change in the Rules.

Board members noted the clarification.

2007 Board Meeting Schedule

Ms. Taxin asked the Board if a day other than Friday would be good for the 2007 Board meeting schedule.

Board members responded that Fridays are best for their schedules.

Ms. Taxin stated that the 2007 schedule will be made for Friday MFT meetings.

NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR:

December 8, 2006

MEETING ADJOURNED AT:

11:10 A.M.

Date Approved

Chairperson, Utah Marriage and Family Therapy
Licensing Board

Date Approved

Bureau Manager, Division of Occupational &
Professional Licensing